

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 119

RC 021 136

AUTHOR Tao, Fumiyo; Arriola, Christine
TITLE Special Analysis of Migrant Education Even Start Data. Even Start Information System.
INSTITUTION Fu Associates, Ltd.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Planning and Evaluation Service.
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 58p.
CONTRACT EA94068001
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; English (Second Language); *Family English Literacy; Family Programs; Literacy Education; Migrant Adult Education; *Migrant Education; Migrant Programs; *Participant Characteristics; Preschool Education
IDENTIFIERS *Even Start; Program Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes data submitted by 11 of 14 state Migrant Education Even Start (MEES) projects operating in 1994-95. These projects provide migrant families with an integrated program of early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education. The data were drawn from the Even Start Information System (ESIS), which collected 1994-95 data on 476 Even Start projects nationwide. The 11 reporting MEES projects served 20-150 families, received funding primarily through local educational agencies, filled various local unmet needs for services, had average combined federal and local funding of \$330,688, and had an average of 7 instructors and 16 total staff. Among instructors, 41 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher, and half had 6 or more years of relevant work experience. Project staff reported on inservice training received, barriers to program implementation, technical assistance needs, service delivery schedules for various educational activities, types of parenting education activities and parent-child activities offered, content of adult education services, integration of core MEES services, collaboration with other agencies, and family needs for support services. Participants were primarily Hispanic two-parent families with an average of four children under age 16. Other family characteristics reported include length of U.S. residence, parent educational background, parent employment status, family income, and English language proficiency. Data on participation outcomes include home visits made, extent of parent and child participation in various services, support services received, prevalence of children with special needs, and retention and successful completion of MEES services. Many data tables are included. (SV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

RC

ED 411 119

EVEN START INFORMATION SYSTEM

**SPECIAL ANALYSIS OF
MIGRANT EDUCATION EVEN START DATA**

1997

Prepared by:

**Fumiyo Tao
Christine Arriola
*Fu Associates, Ltd.***

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for:

**U.S. Department of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RC 021136

SPECIAL ANALYSIS OF MIGRANT EVEN START DATA

Abstract

Special Analysis of Migrant Even Start Data provides a descriptive analysis of the Migrant Education Even Start (MEES) projects and of the children and families that were served by the MEES in 1994-95. It was produced by Fu Associates, Ltd., under contract to the U.S. Department of Education's Planning and Evaluation Service (PES).

Authorized under Section 1202(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, the MEES Program in 1994-95 consisted of 14 grants to State educational agencies (SEAs). These grants were to provide family-centered education projects to help the parents of currently migratory children become full partners in the education of their children, to assist currently migratory children in reaching their full potential as learners, and to provide literacy training to their parents.

This report was prepared under the U.S. Department of Education, Contract Number EA94068001. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
Migrant Education Even Start Program	1
The 1994-95 National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program	2
Special Analyses of Migrant Education Even Start Projects Data ...	3
Organization of the Report	3
SECTION TWO	
CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANT EDUCATION EVEN START PROJECTS	5
Number of Families Served	6
Fiscally Responsible Agency	6
Type of Community	7
Availability of Non-Even Start Adult and Early Childhood Services	8
Project Funding	9
Project Staffing	10
Educational and Relevant Work Experiences of Staff	12
Inservice Training	13
Barriers to Program Implementation	15
Need for Technical Assistance	16
Recruitment Strategies	18
Reasons for Denying Services	19
Intensity of Educational Services	20
Parenting Education Activities	24
Contents of Adult Education Activities	26
Integration of Services	28
Collaboration with Other Agencies	29
Support Services that MEES Families Need	30
SECTION THREE	
CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANT EDUCATION EVEN START FAMILIES	31
Ethnic Backgrounds of Parents and Children	32
Length of Residence in the United States	33
Family Structure and Size	34

Parents' Educational Backgrounds	35
Parents' Employment Status at Intake	36
Family Economic Characteristics	37
Non-Even Start Services Families Received	38
English Language Proficiency Among MEES Parents	40

SECTION FOUR

PARTICIPATION OUTCOMES OF MIGRANT EDUCATION

EVEN START FAMILIES	41
----------------------------------	-----------

Home Visits Made to Families	42
Extent of Participation in Adult Education and Parenting Education .	42
Hours of Participation in Adult and Parenting Education	43
Extent of Participation in Early Childhood Education	44
Support Services Parents and Children Received	46
Number of Children with Special Needs	47
Patterns of Retention	48
Parents' Educational Status at Year End	50
Parents' Employment Status at Year End	51

List of Exhibits

	<u>Page</u>
Exhibit 1.1	Number of Projects That Submitted 1994-95
	Even Start National Evaluation Data 2
Exhibit 2.1	Agency Fiscally Responsible for the MEES Program 6
Exhibit 2.2	Type of Community in Which the MEES Projects Operate 7
Exhibit 2.3	Number of MEES Projects Reporting Availability of Non-Even Start
	Educational Services in Their Communities 8
Exhibit 2.4	Levels of Funding for MEES Projects 9
Exhibit 2.5	Number of MEES-Paid Staff and Their Assignments 10
Exhibit 2.6	Number of MEES-Paid Instructors and Volunteers, by Instructional Area . . 11
Exhibit 2.7	Academic Degrees and Years of Experience of
	MEES Instructors and Aides 12
Exhibit 2.8	Average Percentage of MEES Staff in Each
	Assignment, by the Amount of Inservice Received 13
Exhibit 2.9	Number of MEES Projects Providing Inservice Training, by Topic 14
Exhibit 2.10	Average Rating of Barriers to Program Implementation 15
Exhibit 2.11	Number of MEES Projects Reporting, by
	Areas in Need of Technical Assistance 16
Exhibit 2.12	Number of MEES Project Sites Using Special Recruitment Strategies 18
Exhibit 2.13	Number of MEES Project Sites, by Reasons for Denial of Services 19
Exhibit 2.14	Average Scheduled Contact Hours in MEES Projects,
	by Educational Area 21
Exhibit 2.15	Hours per Month a Typical Family Spends in
	Parent-Child Activities, by Setting 22
Exhibit 2.16	Hours per Month that Adult Education Is Combined with
	Parenting Education 23
Exhibit 2.17	Number of MEES Project Sites Providing Various Types of
	Parenting Education Activities 24
Exhibit 2.18	Number of MEES Project Sites Offering
	Various Parent-Child Activities 25
Exhibit 2.19	Characteristics of MEES Adult Basic Education Services 26
Exhibit 2.20	Number of MEES Project Sites That Offer Preparatory Activities
	Before Initiating Adult and Parenting Education 27
Exhibit 2.21	Level of Integration of Migrant Education
	Even Start Core Services 28
Exhibit 2.22	Number of MEES Project Sites Using MEES and
	Collaborating Agency Staff in Core Educational Services 29
Exhibit 2.23	Number of MEES Project Sites, by Families' Need
	for Support Services 30

Exhibit 3.1	Ethnic Backgrounds of Families in MEES Projects	32
Exhibit 3.2	Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Length of Residence in the United States	33
Exhibit 3.3	Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Family Structure	34
Exhibit 3.4	Average Size of the MEES Families	34
Exhibit 3.5	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Educational Background	35
Exhibit 3.6	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Where They Received Formal Education	35
Exhibit 3.7	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Type of Employment	36
Exhibit 3.8	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents Who Were Not Employed, by Employment Plans	36
Exhibit 3.9	Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Annual Income	37
Exhibit 3.10	Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Primary Income Source	37
Exhibit 3.11	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Social or Educational Services Received	38
Exhibit 3.12	Percent of Children Participating in Non-MEES Educational Programs Before and at Time of Enrolling in MEES	39
Exhibit 3.13	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Language Spoken at Home	40
Exhibit 3.14	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Their Ability to Use the English Language	40
Exhibit 4.1	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents Who Participated in the Core MEES Services	42
Exhibit 4.2	MEES Parents and All Even Start Parents, by Average Hours of Participation in Adult and Parenting Education	43
Exhibit 4.3	Percent (Number) of MEES Children Participating in Early Childhood Education Programs	44
Exhibit 4.4	Percent of MEES Children and All Even Start Children, by Months of Participation in Early Childhood Education	45
Exhibit 4.5	Percent of Parents and Children Receiving Support Services	46
Exhibit 4.6	Number and Percent of MEES Children with Special Needs, by Type of Needs	47
Exhibit 4.7	Percent (Number) of MEES Families Continuing Participation at Year End	48
Exhibit 4.8	Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Reason for Termination	49
Exhibit 4.9	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Educational Status at the End of the Year	50
Exhibit 4.10	Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Employment Status at the End of the Year	51

Section One

Introduction

This report presents the results of special analyses of data from Migrant Education Even Start (MEES) projects operating in 1994-95. The special analyses were conducted at the request of the U.S. Department of Education's (ED's) Office of Migrant Education (OME) and drew on the data collected under the 1994-95 national evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

The purpose of this report is to provide a national profile of the MEES Program that can be used by local projects, state and federal administrators, legislators, and policy-makers for program improvement and policy development.

Section One provides background information on the MEES Program, the scope of data collected in the 1994-95 evaluation, a description of the special analyses, and a summary of the next sections of the report.

Migrant Education Even Start Program

Authorized under Section 1202(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, the MEES Program made grants to state educational agencies (SEAs) to provide family-centered education projects to help the parents of currently migratory children become full partners in the education of their children, to assist currently migratory children in reaching their full potential as learners, and to provide literacy training to their parents. The MEES Program was funded from a 3 percent set-aside from the overall Even Start allocation.¹

While similar to the basic Even Start projects in that they provided participating families with an integrated program of early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education, MEES projects were unique in that they:

- were state operated, as well as state administered;
- served a population that moved frequently and whose home base might not be where the project was located; and

¹ The Even Start Program was reauthorized by the Improving America's School Act which became effective in July of 1995 and brought several legislative changes affecting the MEES program. The evaluation findings presented in this report describe the MEES projects as they operated under the previous legislation.

- provided services on an interstate and intrastate basis, ensuring coordination and cooperation between states (or areas of a state) in which migratory children and parents lived during the year.

In 1994-95, there were fourteen MEES projects, funded at \$2,741,190.

The 1994-95 National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program

Under Section 1209 of the ESEA, as amended, ED was required to provide for an independent evaluation of Even Start. In March 1994, ED awarded a contract for the national evaluation of Even Start to Fu Associates, Ltd., with a subcontract to Abt Associates Inc. The major component of the contract is the development and implementation of the Even Start Information System (ESIS). The ESIS stores the data collected from all Even Start projects and provides ongoing descriptive information across all Even Start projects, including: information about the participating families; the types of projects that have been funded; the services that they provide; the collaborative efforts that these projects have undertaken; and the obstacles that exist to program implementation.

A total of 513 Even Start projects (including 14 MEES projects) were funded in 1994-95. Overall, 93 percent of Even Start projects (476 projects) returned ESIS data by the final due date. Of the 14 MEES projects funded in 1994-95, 79 percent (11 projects) returned ESIS data by the final due date (Exhibit 1.1).

Exhibit 1.1		
Number of Projects That Submitted 1994-95 Even Start National Evaluation Data		
Type of Project	Number (and Percent) of Projects Reporting	Number of Projects Operating in 1994-95
State-administered Even Start projects	458 (93%)	490
Migrant Education Even Start projects	11 (79%)	14
Tribal Even Start projects	7 (78%)	9
Total	476 (93%)	513

Special Analyses of Migrant Education Even Start Projects Data

This report consists of a special analysis of 1994-95 ESIS data submitted by 11 MEES projects.² As shown in Exhibit 1.1, the 11 projects represent a very small portion of the entire Even Start community. Therefore, the analyses of the project-level and project site-level data were based on an extremely small number of records. Because the data from all MEES projects are not available, readers should use caution in generalizing descriptive analysis results (e.g., averages) presented in this report to all MEES projects. It should also be noted that the data submitted by these projects had missing data to varying degrees, in some cases as much as the entire data collection forms.

Organization of the Report

Section Two: Characteristics of Migrant Education Even Start Projects presents descriptions of migrant projects, including the project-level information on funding and educational and support services provided as well as project site-level information on staffing, inservice training, barriers to program implementation, and areas needing technical assistance.

Section Three: Characteristics of Migrant Education Even Start Families describes the demographic backgrounds of MEES families, parents, and children.

Section Four: Participation Outcomes of Migrant Education Even Start Families presents the extent of participation in educational activities by MEES parents and children and the rates of retention and program completion.

The basic format of this report is to present analysis results in exhibits accompanied by a brief narrative that assists readers in interpreting the results. Some of the results for the Migrant Education projects are compared with results for all Even Start projects. To highlight these comparisons, they are presented in bold type throughout the report.

² Detailed descriptions of three MEES projects based on case studies conducted in 1994 are reported in *National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Report on Migrant Even Start Projects* (Levin, M., Gamse, B., Swartz, J., Tao, F., & Tarr, H., U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997).

Section Two

Characteristics of Migrant Education Even Start Projects

This section presents information about MEES projects. The current national evaluation collects project-related data on two levels. Data concerning project structure, organization, and management are collected for each project as a unit. That is, each project provides information describing the project as a whole. However, detailed descriptions of services offered to participants are reported by project sites.

In the context of this evaluation, the term "site" does not refer to a physical or geographical location where a project's services are provided. Instead, the term refers to *service delivery designs and approaches*. Some projects use two or more distinctly different approaches (e.g., services designed for teen parents enrolled at a high school and a different set of services designed for older parents operated through collaboration with a community college and a Head Start program). Projects were instructed to report separate site-level information on multiple sites/designs, if they use more than one service delivery approach.

The first part of this section pertains to the administrative characteristics of MEES projects as a whole. Topics analyzed at the project level include:

- Number of families served;
- Fiscally responsible agency;
- Type of community;
- Accessibility of non-Even Start adult and early childhood services;
- Project funding;
- Project staffing;
- Educational and relevant work experiences of staff;
- Inservice training;
- Barriers to program implementation; and
- Need for technical assistance.

The second part of this section describes the services MEES projects offer to migrant families, based on information collected by project sites. Topics analyzed at the project site level include:

- Recruitment strategies;
- Reasons for denying services;
- Intensity of educational services;
- Parenting education activities;

- Contents of adult education activities;
- Integration of services;
- Collaboration with other agencies; and
- Support services that MEES families need.

Among the 11 MEES projects that submitted data for 1994-95, one project reported data for four sites; seven projects reported one site each; and three projects did not submit any site-level data. Results of analyses based on project sites are noted as such in the exhibits and in the text in this section.

Number of Families Served

Across 11 MEES projects reporting data, the average number of families they anticipated serving in the 1994-95 program year was about 72. The number of families ranged from 20 to 150 with a standard deviation of 45.

Fiscally Responsible Agency

Nine out of the 10 MEES projects responding to this item reported that a local educational agency has fiscal responsibility for their program. One project cited a community-based or another non-profit organization as having the fiscal responsibility (Exhibit 2.1).

Exhibit 2.1 Agency Fiscally Responsible for the MEES Program	
	Number of Projects
Local educational agency	9
Community-based or other non-profit organization	1
Note: One project did not respond to this question.	

Type of Community

The majority of the 11 MEES projects operate in areas that include both urban and rural communities (5 projects) or in primarily rural areas (4 projects). Only 2 projects operate in urban areas (Exhibit 2.2).

Exhibit 2.2	
Type of Community in Which the MEES Projects Operate	
	Number of Projects
Entirely metropolitan area (Urban)	2
Metropolitan and non-metropolitan combined (Mixed)	5
Non-metropolitan area (Rural)	4

Availability of Non-Even Start Adult and Early Childhood Services

As shown in Exhibit 2.3, most of the MEES projects reported that, aside from the services they provide, similar services for adult education, English-as-a-second-language (ESL) courses, and early childhood education for children aged 3-5 are available in their communities to low-income families. However, without the MEES, parenting education, early childhood education for infants and toddlers, and family literacy programs would not be available in many of these communities.

Exhibit 2.3	
Number of MEES Projects Reporting Availability of Non-Even Start Educational Services in Their Communities	
	Number of Projects
Adult basic education (grades 0-8)	9
Adult secondary education/GED preparation (grades 9-12)	9
English as a second language (ESL)	8
Parenting education	4
Early childhood education for children aged 0-2	5
Early childhood education for children aged 3-4	8
Early childhood education for children at age 5	7
Other family literacy programs	4
Note: The numbers are based on 11 MEES projects.	

Project Funding

As shown in Exhibit 2.4, the average federal funding for MEES projects for the 1994-95 program year was \$215,918, compared to an average of \$173,586 for all Even Start projects. The MEES funding was \$42,332 per project more than the national Even Start average.

The average amount of local contribution for MEES projects (\$107,386) was greater than the average for all Even Start projects (\$87,161). The average local contribution for MEES projects was \$20,225 more than the national Even Start average.

The total resources--federal funding and local contributions combined--were \$330,688 per MEES project; the average total resources across all Even Start projects were \$263,975. The average for the MEES projects was \$66,713 more than the national Even Start average.

Exhibit 2.4			
Levels of Funding for MEES Projects			
	1994-95 MEES Grant	1994-95 Local Contributions	1994-95 Total Resources
Average per project	\$215,918	\$ 107,386	\$330,688
Amounts received by the top 25% of the projects	\$259,677 or more	\$183,963 or more	\$397,461 or more
Total projects reporting	9	10	9
Note: Total resources were calculated for projects that had reported both their federal grant and their local contributions.			

Project Staffing

On average, a MEES project was staffed with approximately 16 individuals who were paid by MEES funds: 2 administrators; 7 instructors; 3 aides; 1 family specialist; about 3 support service providers (e.g., a social worker or child care provider); and 1 evaluator (Exhibit 2.5).

Exhibit 2.5			
Number of MEES-Paid Staff and Their Assignments			
Staff	Average Across 11 Projects	Range	Standard Deviation
Administrator	1.9 staff	1- 6 staff	1.64
Instructor	6.5	1-22	7.23
Aide	3.2	0-12	3.87
Family specialists	0.7	0- 3	0.90
Support service providers	2.5	0- 9	3.08
Evaluators	0.6	0- 2	0.67
Others	0.2	0- 2	0.60
Total across all categories	15.6	3-42	12.48
Note: This table includes only the staff who were paid totally or partially with MEES funds. The numbers do not include staff who were paid solely with local matching or collaborating agency funds. If staff had several roles, they were counted once under their primary assignment.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In adult education, the MEES projects had an average of 2 instructors paid by MEES and 4 volunteers (Exhibit 2.6). Parenting education was taught by about 4 instructors paid by MEES and 2 volunteers. Early childhood education was taught by 4 instructors assisted by 4 volunteers.

Exhibit 2.6				
Number of MEES-Paid Instructors and Volunteers, by Instructional Area				
Instructional Area	Instructors		Volunteers	
	Average	Range	Average	Range
Adult education	1.7	0-7	3.6	0-14
Parenting education	3.7	0-19	2.4	0-10
Early childhood education	3.8	0-19	3.7	0-16
Total	6.5	1-22	8.6	0-24
Note: The total is less than the sum of staff in three instructional areas because instructors and volunteers could be counted in all areas they teach, but only once in the total.				

Educational and Relevant Work Experiences of Staff

More than one-third of instructors paid by MEES had earned at least a bachelor's degree; 30 percent had a bachelor's degree, and 11 percent had a master's degree (Exhibit 2.7). Another 29 percent of instructors had an associate's degree, and the same percentage had a high school diploma or GED certificate as their highest level of education. Not surprisingly, teachers' aides as a group had lower levels of educational attainment. All the aides had at least a high school diploma or GED certificate; 82 percent had no postsecondary education; the remaining 18 percent had a bachelor's degree.

In addition to their academic degrees, 26 percent of teachers and almost 18 percent of aides had earned their Child Development Associates' certificate (CDA) or some other certification pertinent to the area they taught in Migrant Education Even Start.

Half of the instructors paid by MEES had at least 6 years of relevant work experience, and another 49 percent had between 1 and 5 years of teaching experience. Most of the aides had 1 to 5 years relevant experience (75 percent).

Exhibit 2.7		
Academic Degrees and Years of Experience of MEES Instructors and Aides		
Highest Level of Education Completed	Percent of Instructors	Percent of Aides
Did not complete HS diploma or GED	1%	0%
High school diploma or GED	29%	82%
AA	29%	0%
BA/BS	30%	18%
MA/MS/MEd	11%	0%
PhD/EdD	0%	0%
Special certification or endorsements (including CDA) relevant to Even Start instruction	26%	18%
Years of Experience		
Less than 1 year	1%	13%
1-5 years	49%	75%
6-10 years	37%	13%
More than 10 years	13%	0%
Note: The total number of instructors used to calculate the education percentage was 80, and the number used to calculate the work experience percentage was 87. The total number of aides used to calculate the education percentage was 22, and the number used to calculate the work experience percentage was 16.		

Inservice Training

Over half of the MEES projects' administrators received 81 hours or more of inservice training in 1994-95, with 78 percent of the administrators receiving over 40 hours or five days (Exhibit 2.8). Similarly 54 percent of instructors received 81 hours or more of inservice training, and 31 percent of instructors received between 41 and 80 hours of inservice training. The majority of family specialists and aides received over 40 hours of training, though they received less training than administrators and instructors.

Exhibit 2.8					
Average Percentage of MEES Staff in Each Assignment, by the Amount of Inservice Received					
	Hours of Inservice Training				
	None	1-8 Hours	9-40 Hours	41-80 Hours	81 Hours or More
Administrators	0	0	23%	20%	58%
Instructors	0	0	15%	31%	54%
Family specialists	0	0	43%	29%	29%
Aides	0	6%	25%	25%	44%
Note: Four projects that did not have any Family Specialists, and 3 projects that did not have any Aides were not included in the average percentages for these assignment categories.					

Exhibit 2.9 shows the number of projects that provided inservice training on a range of topics to no staff, some staff, and most staff. Topics in the program coordination area (especially recruitment, program improvement, and conducting home visits) and issues related to parenting education were taught to most staff in most MEES projects.

Exhibit 2.9**Number of MEES Projects Providing Inservice Training, by Topic**

Training Topic	Staff Trained		
	No Staff	Some Staff	Most Staff
Program Coordination			
Recruitment	1	1	9
Retention strategies	1	4	5
Team building	1	3	7
Interagency collaboration	0	4	7
Local program evaluation	0	4	7
National program evaluation	0	4	7
Planning or program improvement	0	1	10
Conducting home visits	1	1	9
Visiting other programs	0	5	5
First Aid, CPR, or other emergency procedures	1	3	5
Adult Education			
ESL	1	2	7
Reading, writing, math, social studies	2	3	6
Vocational/occupational	1	6	4
Assessment	0	3	7
Parenting Education			
Parent's role as a teacher	0	1	9
Parent and child activities	0	1	10
Child rearing, child development	0	1	9
Life skills	1	2	7
Early Childhood Education			
ESL	1	3	6
School readiness	1	3	7
Child development	0	3	8
Classroom or behavior management	1	2	8
Assessment	1	3	7
Family Characteristics			
Assessing family educational needs	1	2	8
Relating instruction to ethnic/cultural backgrounds	0	5	6
Dealing with family or personal problems	1	4	6
Adapting instruction for learners with special needs	1	4	6
Note: Some rows do not add up to 11 because not all MEES projects had responded to that topic.			

Barriers to Program Implementation

Projects were presented with a list of potential barriers to program implementation and asked to rate each barrier from 1 to 5, where 1 is no problem and 5 is major problem. In general, the average ratings indicate that projects do not face many serious barriers in implementing MEES services. Only three issues were rated as being more than "somewhat" problematic: improving retention or motivation of participants, improving attendance, and arranging or providing adequate transportation (Exhibit 2.10). These three issues were also cited by many Even Start projects in the national evaluation as major problems.

Exhibit 2.10	
Average Rating of Barriers to Program Implementation	
	Mean
Recruiting eligible families	1.73
Recruiting families most in need	1.73
Improving retention or motivation of participants	3.18
Improving attendance	2.91
Coordinating with other agencies	1.82
Obtaining sufficient financial resources	2.18
Understanding or meeting national evaluation requirements	1.73
Meeting local evaluation requirements	1.36
Hiring and retaining qualified staff	2.18
Obtaining adequate facilities, space, or equipment	1.82
Arranging or providing adequate transportation	2.91
Meeting social service needs of families	2.09
Finding quality child care	2.55
Understanding or working within the federal regulations	1.45
Understanding or working within state guidelines	1.64
Working within the confines of the local model	1.73
Finding adult education, parenting education, or early childhood services locally	2.18
Note: The means are based on 11 responding MEES projects.	

Need for Technical Assistance

The MEES projects were presented with a list of issues for which they may need technical assistance and asked to rate each issue from 1 to 3, where "1 = no need" and "3 = great need" for assistance (Exhibit 2.11). Of the 11 MEES projects reporting, 9 or 10 projects expressed at least some need for technical assistance in the following areas: Funding; participant involvement and retention; staff development; sharing information; curriculum materials; approaches to adult, parenting, and early childhood education; using computers; transportation problems; and NCFL and PEP/NDN validation. **Across all Even Start projects, the types of technical assistance needed were generally similar to those reported by the MEES projects.**

Exhibit 2.11			
Number of MEES Projects Reporting, by Areas in Need of Technical Assistance			
	No Need	Some Need	Great Need
Program Operations			
Program administration	5	6	0
Interagency collaboration	5	6	0
Funding or fiscal issues	2	6	3
Recruiting families	6	5	0
Increasing participant involvement or retention	2	8	1
Staff development	2	9	0
Educational Services			
Sharing information with other projects	0	10	1
Selecting or implementing curriculum materials	2	7	2
Integrating program components	6	5	0
Improving retention	3	8	0
Identifying effective practices	3	7	1
Approaches to adult education	1	10	0
Approaches to parenting education	1	10	0
Approaches to early childhood education	2	9	0
Making home visits	6	5	0
Using computers	1	6	4

Exhibit 2.11, Continued**Number of MEES Projects Reporting, by Areas in Need of Technical Assistance**

	No Need	Some Need	Great Need
Support Services			
Solving transportation problems	2	4	5
Handling social or health problems	3	6	2
Maintaining balance of educational and support services	3	7	1
Evaluation			
Conducting a local evaluation	6	4	1
Complying with the national evaluation requirements (ESIS)	5	6	0
Administering and scoring assessment instruments	3	8	0
Being validated by the National Center for Family Literacy	2	7	2
Preparing a PEP/NDN submission	2	6	3

Recruitment Strategies

The MEES projects were presented with a list of recruitment strategies commonly used by Even Start projects and asked to indicate how often they used each strategy: not used; used little; used some; or used a great deal (Exhibit 2.12). Of the 11 MEES project sites reported by 7 projects, 6 or more sites used the following strategies some or a great deal: home visits; word of mouth; collaborating agencies; walking the neighborhood; referrals from public schools, community or governmental agencies; telephone contact; posters and flyers; and presentations or visits to community agencies.

Exhibit 2.12				
Number of MEES Project Sites Using Special Recruitment Strategies				
Recruitment Strategy	Not Used	Used Little	Used Some	Used a Great Deal
Referrals by Head Start or other preschool program	1	4	1	4
Referrals by community or governmental agencies	2	1	4	3
Walking the neighborhood	2	0	8	0
Home visits	1	0	6	4
Telephone contact	3	0	7	0
Word of mouth	1	0	3	6
Targeted mailings	8	0	2	0
Mass media	4	3	2	1
Posters or flyers	1	2	6	1
Collaborating agencies	1	0	6	3
Presentations or visits to community agencies	2	1	6	1
Other	0	1	2	3
Note: The numbers for this table are based on 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects. Some row totals do not equal 11 due to missing data for some project site(s).				

Reasons for Denying Services

Recruiting the number of eligible families that each project intends to serve does not appear to be a problem, either major or minor, for the majority of the MEES projects. In fact, 5 of the 11 project sites reported having to deny eligible families entry into the program or to place families on a waiting list until spaces became available. These projects reported a variety of reasons for denying services. As shown in Exhibit 2.13, some of their reasons included: family lives outside target area (4 project sites); parent refused to participate in adult education (3 project sites); family was already enrolled in appropriate programs meeting their needs (3 project sites); and parent had a high school diploma, GED, or its equivalent (2 project sites).

Exhibit 2.13	
Number of MEES Project Sites, by Reasons for Denial of Services	
	Number of MEES Project Sites
Parent has high school diploma, GED or equivalent	2
Family has income higher than specified level	0
Parent has a high score on a literacy measure	0
Parent refused to participate in adult education	3
Family already enrolled in appropriate programs meeting their needs	3
Family lives outside target area	4
Other	3
Note: Only five project sites that indicated denying services were to respond to this question. Project sites were able to select more than one reason.	

Intensity of Educational Services

In order to assess the intensity of the educational services provided by MEES projects, we asked project directors to report the following: (1) scheduled contact times per month; (2) hours per month; (3) number of months per year; and (4) hours per month that services are provided in participants' homes. These data were to represent the service delivery schedules for a typical family, not any specific family.

This was a complex set of questions since many educational activities are intended to serve more than one purpose. For example, adult education classes could incorporate topics that are relevant to parenting education. The projects were instructed to "double-count" the hours of instruction that serve multiple purposes. Thus, if a project provides families two hours per month of parent-child activities during home visits, those two hours could count toward both parenting education and early childhood education.

Exhibit 2.14 lists the scheduled contact hours averaged across MEES projects (in bold) as well as the comparable averages for all Even Start projects (in parentheses). **For the adult education services offered by MEES projects, the scheduled instructional sessions were, on average, 10 to 12 times per month, 7 to 8 months out of the year. The adult education services were offered during fewer months in MEES projects compared to all Even Start projects, most likely reflecting the seasonal relocations of program participants in many MEES projects. Consequently, the average hours per year per participant for MEES are also lower (about 230 hours) than the national averages (340-367 hours).**

Among the MEES projects, the average hours of instruction per month for adult education was 25-28 hours. These figures translate to between 6 and 7 hours per week that the typical MEES adult student was expected to spend receiving instruction. A portion of this time, about 1 to 2 hours per month, was scheduled to be spent in families' homes as part of the home-based education component. When presenting these data, it is important to note the wide range of responses across project sites. For example, the number of hours of adult education that MEES projects offered each month ranged from none to 56 hours.

The MEES parents were offered considerably less time in parenting education than in adult education. Parenting education was offered an average of 13 times per month, combining the activities for parents alone and for parents and children together. The two types of parenting education activities averaged about 9 to 10 hours per month and were held 9 months out of the year. These averages amount to 101 hours per year of activities for parents alone and 118 hours of activities for parents and children together. Finally, approximately 2 to 3 hours out of the 9 to 10 hours in each type of parenting education activity were intended to occur in participants' homes.

Early childhood education had the most number of scheduled contact hours; the scheduled instruction hours for ages 3 and 4 were 590 hours per year. Children under the age of 3 and children age 5 were scheduled to receive about the same number of hours per year (400 hours).

Similar to the adult education services, early childhood education services were offered for fewer number of months (4-7 months) by MEES projects than by Even Start projects nationally (10 months). However, for children ages birth through 5, the hours of services during these months were substantially greater in MEES projects (50-68 hours) than in Even Start projects nationally (35-53 hours).

Exhibit 2.14

Average Scheduled Contact Hours in MEES Projects, by Educational Area
(Averages across all Even Start projects are shown in parentheses.)

Educational Area	Number of MEES Sites Reporting	Number of Times per Month	Number of Hours per Month	Duration of Instruction in Months	Hours per Month Services Are in Home-Based Setting	Average Hours per Year per Participant
Adult Education						
Beginning adult basic education (grades 0-4)	10	10 times (11 times)	25 hours (34 hours)	8 months (10 months)	2 hours (4 hours)	234 hours (341 hours)
Intermediate adult basic education (grades 5-8)	10	10 (12)	25 (34)	8 (10)	2 (4)	234 (351)
Secondary/GED (grades 9-12)	9	12 (12)	28 (36)	7 (10)	1 (4)	231 (367)
ESL	9	12 (11)	30 (31)	7 (10)	2 (4)	260 (311)
Parenting Education						
Parent alone	10	5 (7)	9 (10)	9 (10)	2 (3)	101 (99)
Parent and child together	10	8 (8)	10 (10)	9 (10)	3 (3)	118 (96)
Early Childhood Education						
Under age 3	9	10 (10)	50 (35)	7 (10)	2 (3)	392 (350)
Ages 3 and 4	10	15 (13)	76 (49)	8 (10)	3 (3)	590 (489)
Age 5	10	12 (14)	68 (53)	6 (10)	1 (3)	410 (519)
Ages 6 and 7	10	9 (12)	53 (59)	4 (10)	1 (3)	192 (557)

Note: 11 MEES sites were used in calculating the average number of times per month, hours per month, duration of instruction in months, and hours per month services are in home-based settings. However, if a site did not have data for hours per month and duration in months, then that site was not included in the average hours per year calculation. The "national Even Start" averages are based on 567 project sites operated by 476 Even Start projects, including the 11 MEES sites, that submitted evaluation data.

The MEES projects were asked to indicate how many hours each month a typical family spends in parent-child joint activities in each of three settings: (1) home visits; (2) center or classroom; and (3) field trips, meals, or other social functions. **On average, the MEES projects offered about 3 hours of joint parent-child activities in the home, about 5 hours in the center or classroom, and 3 hours in extracurricular activities (Exhibit 2.15). These results were generally consistent with the results obtained for all Even Start projects.**

Exhibit 2.15			
Hours per Month a Typical Family Spends in Parent-Child Activities, by Setting			
Structured Settings	Number of MEES Project Sites Reporting	Average Hours per Month	Range of Hours Reported
Home visits	11	3	0-8
Center or classroom	11	5	0-12
Field trips, meals, or social functions	11	3	0-8
Note: Based on data from 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.			

The MEES project directors were also asked to indicate how many hours per month adult education was combined with parenting education for a typical family in their projects. **Integration of these two educational components occurred, on average, 10 to 11 hours per month (Exhibit 2.16).** These results were also similar to the results for all Even Start projects.

Exhibit 2.16			
Hours per Month that Adult Education Is Combined with Parenting Education			
Adult Education Components	Number of MEES Project Sites Reporting	Average Hours per Month	Range of Hours Reported
Beginning adult basic education (grades 0-4)	11	11	0-48
Intermediate adult basic education (grades 5-8)	11	11	0-48
Adult secondary education/ GED preparation (grades 9-12)	11	10	0-48
ESL	11	11	0-48
Note: Based on data from 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.			

Parenting Education Activities

The MEES projects were presented with a list of topics and issues commonly addressed in parenting education activities and asked to indicate whether they address each of these topics with: most families; some families; few families; or no families (Exhibit 2.17). Most of the reporting project sites indicated that they address most of the topics listed with most of their families. In particular, the following topics are emphasized consistently across all MEES project sites: child development; child's language and thinking skills; child's social skills; child's safety and well-being; parent self-esteem; parent life skills; parent health and nutrition; and parent-child literacy. All 11 sites also address assisting with homework and awareness of community services.

Exhibit 2.17				
Number of MEES Project Sites Providing Various Types of Parenting Education Activities				
Parenting Education Activities	Most Families	Some Families	Few Families	Not Taught
Child development	10	1	0	0
Child's language & thinking skills	10	1	0	0
Child's motor skills	9	1	0	0
Child's social skills	10	1	0	0
Assisting with homework	5	6	0	0
Using TV or outings for instruction	5	3	3	0
Behavior management	6	4	1	0
School routines	9	1	0	0
Child's safety and well-being	10	1	0	0
Parent self-esteem	11	0	0	0
Parent life skills	9	2	0	0
Awareness of community and social service	8	3	0	0
Awareness of vocational and educational opportunities	7	3	1	0
Health and nutrition	11	0	0	0
Parent-child literacy	10	1	0	0
Note: The numbers for this table are based on 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.				

The MEES projects were asked how frequently activities involving the parent and child together were used in their program (Exhibit 2.18). All MEES projects taught most families language development and health and nutrition. A majority of the projects taught sensory stimulation, arts and crafts, reading, storytelling, pre-reading, and early academic skills to most of their families (10, 10, 9, 8 project sites, respectively). Overall, most of the activities were offered to at least some families by most of the MEES project sites, with the exception of computer activities.

Exhibit 2.18				
Number of MEES Project Sites Offering Various Parent-Child Activities				
Activity	Most Families	Some Families	Few Families	Not Taught
Language development	11	0	0	0
Reading, storytelling, pre-reading	9	1	0	0
Working with letters and writing	5	5	0	1
Working with numbers	6	5	0	0
Early academic skills	8	3	0	0
Computer activities	4	3	0	4
Sensory stimulation	10	0	1	0
Arts and crafts	10	1	0	0
Gross motor activities	7	4	0	0
Social development	8	3	0	0
Independence, self-discipline, self-help skills	7	2	1	1
Health and nutrition	11	0	0	0
Activities selected and led by child	6	3	2	0
Note: The numbers for this table are based on data reported for 11 project sites by 7 MEES projects.				

Contents of Adult Education Activities

Exhibit 2.19 summarizes the MEES adult basic education services in terms of: (1) the extent of incorporating functional literacy in the primary instructional approach; and (2) the context in which instruction was presented. The majority of MEES project sites included little or no functional literacy in their beginning adult basic education instruction. Most of the project sites reported incorporating functional literacy in their secondary/GED classes.

We also asked MEES project directors to describe their adult basic education services in terms of three broad categories of instructional contexts: life skills; vocational; and parenting. Because projects could frame their instructions in more than one way within each programmatic component, project directors were asked to select all applicable contexts.

Many MEES project sites employed a combination of instructional contexts across the four educational levels. In general, life skills and parenting were commonly used as contexts for adult education instruction and ESL. Fewer project sites reported using vocational as context, especially for beginning ABE (2 project sites).

Exhibit 2.19				
Characteristics of MEES Adult Basic Education Services (Number of MEES Project Sites)				
Primary Instructional Approach	Adult Education Components			
	Beginning Adult Basic Education (0-4)	Intermediate Adult Basic Education (5-8)	Adult Secondary Education/ GED (9-12)	ESL
Mostly functional literacy	3	4	7	3
Some functional literacy	1	3	1	4
Little or no functional literacy	5	1	1	2
Instructional Context	Beginning Adult Basic Education (0-4)	Intermediate Adult Basic Education (5-8)	Adult Secondary Education/ GED (9-12)	ESL
Life skills	7	7	8	9
Vocational	2	3	4	4
Parenting	7	7	7	7
Note: The numbers for this table are based on data reported for 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.				

The MEES project sites were asked how they worked with parents during the preparation period before the parents are fully engaged in adult education and parenting education. Most project sites conducted home visits as preparation for the transition (10 project sites). Six sites had some sort of orientation sessions for the parents. Only one project site indicated having no preparation activities before starting the adult and parenting education (Exhibit 2.20).

Exhibit 2.20 Number of MEES Project Sites That Offer Preparatory Activities Before Initiating Adult and Parenting Education Services	
	Number of MEES Project Sites
No preparation period before adult education and parenting education	1
Begin parenting education first	1
Begin adult education first	2
Conduct orientation sessions	6
Invite to social functions	2
Invite to field trips or other outings	3
Conduct home visits	10
Other	1
Note: The numbers for this table are based on 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.	

Integration of Services

The MEES project directors were asked to rate the extent to which instructional activities were integrated across (1) Parenting Education and Adult Basic Education, (2) Parenting Education and Early Childhood Education, and (3) Adult Basic Education and Early Childhood Education for their typical family. Integration of services was operationalized as the frequency with which activities in two core educational components were: (1) provided in the same setting (e.g., the same room or building); (2) taught by the same instructors; (3) using the same or parallel activities; and (4) planning or coordinating for parents and children together. Exhibit 2.21 displays the results for each measure of service integration.

Of the three educational components, the highest degree of integration was reported between parenting and early childhood education, especially in the form of parent-child joint activities.

Exhibit 2.21									
Level of Integration of Migrant Education Even Start Core Services									
Nature of Integration	Parenting & Adult Basic Education			Parenting & Early Childhood Education			Adult & Early Childhood Education		
	Never	Sometimes	Always/Usually	Never	Sometimes	Always/Usually	Never	Sometimes	Always/Usually
Same setting	2	3	4	1	3	5	2	2	5
Same instructors	1	5	3	0	5	4	3	3	3
Same or parallel activities	1	4	4	0	4	5	1	6	2
Parent-child joint activities	1	4	4	0	1	8	0	4	5
Note: The numbers for this table are based on data reported for 11 project sites by 7 MEES projects.									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collaboration with Other Agencies

The MEES projects were asked who is primarily responsible for delivering various components of core educational services to participants: staff paid with MEES funds; staff paid by one of the agencies collaborating with MEES; or staff from both. (Here again, project instructors were considered as MEES staff if any portion of their salaries was paid for with MEES funds.)

Among MEES projects, most of the adult education classes were conducted by staff from collaborating agencies or by both MEES and collaborating agency staff. In contrast, the majority of the parenting education and early childhood education (ECE) staff were primarily funded by MEES, particularly ECE for younger children (Exhibit 2.22).

Exhibit 2.22				
Number of MEES Project Sites Using MEES and Collaborating Agency Staff in Core Educational Services				
	MEES	Other Agency	Both	Neither
Adult Education				
Beginning adult basic education (grades 0-4)	2	5	3	0
Intermediate adult basic education (grades 5-8)	1	5	4	0
Adult secondary education/GED preparation (grades 9-12)	1	5	3	0
ESL	0	5	4	0
Parenting Education	6	0	2	0
Early Childhood Education				
Under age 3	7	1	2	0
Ages 3 and 4	6	1	3	0
Age 5	4	1	4	0
Ages 6 and 7	2	4	3	1
Note: The numbers are based on data reported for 11 project sites by 7 MEES projects.				

Support Services that MEES Families Need

The MEES project directors were asked to indicate whether "all," "many," "few," or "none" of their project families were in need of 14 categories of support services. Exhibit 2.23 displays the percentages of project sites responding to each category of support services.

The needs for transportation, child care, meals, and nutrition assistance are prevalent among MEES families as they are among all Even Start families. Further, the majority of the MEES project sites reported that many of their families need assistance with housing, health care, family support, financial issues, and translating/interpreting services.

Exhibit 2.23				
Number of MEES Project Sites, by Families' Need for Support Services				
Support Services	All Families	Many Families	Few Families	None
Transportation	2	7	2	0
Child care	4	4	3	0
Meals	3	4	3	1
Nutrition assistance	2	8	1	0
Housing	0	6	3	2
Health care	1	8	2	0
Mental health	0	2	7	2
Employment assistance	1	4	6	0
Family support	1	8	2	0
Crisis intervention	0	2	7	2
Special care for person(s) with disabilities	0	1	7	3
Financial assistance	0	6	4	1
Translators or interpreters	1	7	2	1
Case management	1	4	5	1
Note: The numbers for this table are based on 11 project sites operated by 7 MEES projects.				

Section Three

Characteristics of Migrant Education Even Start Families

This section describes the social and economic characteristics of families that enrolled in the Migrant Education Even Start projects during the program year 1994-95. This program year was the first year in which family data were collected for the current national evaluation. In most Even Start projects, there were families that continued from previous years as well as new families that enrolled during this program year. Although some projects collect basic demographic information on all new families at the time of intake, we could not ensure the uniformity and accuracy of such information on "continuing families" across all projects. Thus, for the purpose of the national evaluation, we asked projects to report family intake data only on new families using the common data collection instrument. This section presents the characteristics of families at the time of intake.

This section addresses the following topics:

- Ethnic backgrounds of families in MEES projects;
- Length of residence in the United States;
- Family structure and size;
- Parents' educational backgrounds;
- Parents' employment status at intake;
- Family economic characteristics;
- Non-Even Start services families received; and
- English language proficiency among the MEES parents.

Ethnic Backgrounds of Parents and Children

A large majority of the adults in the Migrant Education Even Start Program are Hispanic (72 percent), and 13 and 12 percent of the adults are white or Asian, respectively (Exhibit 3.1). African Americans and American Indians constitute a small percentage of the population.

The ethnic composition of the MEES families differs considerably from the Even Start projects nationally; across all Even Start projects, 36 percent of families are Hispanic, 34 percent are Caucasian, 23 percent African American, 5 percent Asian, and 2 percent American Indian.

In the MEES projects, 75 percent of the children are Hispanic. Only 12 percent are white; 8 percent are Asian; and African Americans make up 4 percent of this population.

Exhibit 3.1				
Ethnic Backgrounds of Families in MEES Projects				
	Parents		Children	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Hispanic	72%	879	75%	1129
Caucasian	13%	153	12%	183
African American	3%	42	4%	59
Asian	12%	151	8%	127
American Indian	<1%	3	<1%	5
Total	100%	1228	100%	1503

Length of Residence in the United States

A majority of the families (59 percent) served by the MEES had lived in the United States for at least five years at the time of intake. However, 41 percent of the families had lived in the United States for five years or less at the time of their intake interview (Exhibit 3.2).

Exhibit 3.2		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Length of Residence in the United States		
Less than one year	10%	(66)
One to five years	31%	(270)
More than five years	59%	(387)
Total	100%	(657)
Note: This information was missing for 72 families that enrolled in 1994-95.		

The data collection instrument asks families to indicate the *longest* amount of time *anyone* in the family had lived in the United States. We expect that many families served by the MEES may have immigrated to the United States recently. However, in many migrant families, one parent (e.g., the father) may first move to the United States to secure employment before the rest of the family immigrates. In such cases, the later immigrants (e.g., the mother and children) may be most likely to receive MEES services. Yet, according to the data collection instruction, families would report how long the father had lived in the United States. Thus, the data reported by the MEES projects for this question may not accurately portray the length of residence in the United States by participating parents.

Family Structure and Size

Seventy-five percent of the families served by the MEES are headed by couples (Exhibit 3.3). Only 15 percent are headed by a single parent, and 9 percent represent extended families. A much lower percentage of Even Start families in general (48 percent), compared to the MEES families, are two-parent families; a higher percentage of Even Start families in general are headed by single parents (39 percent) compared to the MEES families.

Exhibit 3.3		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Family Structure		
Single parent	15%	(105)
Couple with children	75%	(512)
Extended family	9%	(60)
Other	1%	(4)
Total	100%	(681)

The average size of the MEES families is 6, with an average of about 2 children within the MEES eligible age (birth through 7 years). Typically, these families also have 2 additional children between the ages of 8 and 15 years and 2 adults (Exhibit 3.4).

Exhibit 3.4		
Average Size of the MEES Families		
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Children below the age of 8 years	2.1	1.1
Children aged 8 through 15 years	1.8	1.3
Persons aged 16 or older	2.4	1.1
Total number in the household	6.4	2.1

Parents' Educational Backgrounds

While a very small percentage (2 percent) of parents enroll in the MEES Program with no previous schooling, almost two-fifths (39 percent) had only an elementary school education (up to 6th Grade). Further, a majority (65 percent) of parents enrolling in the MEES Program had a 9th-grade education or lower (Exhibit 3.5).

The educational history of parents served by the MEES is substantially limited compared to Even Start parents in general. The national Even Start data showed that 41 percent of parents had reached 10th through 12th grade, and 16 percent had completed high school. Among the MEES parents, the comparable percentages were 23 percent and 11 percent, respectively.

Exhibit 3.5		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Educational Background		
No education - 6th grade	39%	(393)
7th - 9th grade	26%	(264)
10th - 12th grade	23%	(227)
High school diploma/GED	9%	(93)
Beyond high school	3%	(30)
Total	100%	(1,007)

Additionally, 70 percent of MEES parents completed most of their formal education outside the United States, which is roughly twice as high as the average of 34 percent for all Even Start projects (Exhibit 3.6).

Exhibit 3.6		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Where They Received Formal Education		
Educated in the United States	30%	(293)
Educated outside the United States	70%	(674)
Total	100%	(967)

Parents' Employment Status at Intake

Fifty-seven (57) percent of MEES parents were employed at the time of enrollment. This is almost twice as high as the national Even Start figure of 27 percent. Of the MEES parents who were employed, one-half had full-time jobs (Exhibit 3.7).

Exhibit 3.7		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Type of Employment		
Full-time job	50%	(273)
Part-time job	49%	(263)
Job training program	1%	(5)
Total	100%	(541)
Note: The percentages are based on the MEES parents who were employed at the time of enrollment.		

As Exhibit 3.8 shows, of the MEES parents who were not employed at the time of enrollment, 15 percent were enrolled in school, and 28 percent were seeking employment. The highest percentage in this group, however, were not seeking employment, not enrolled in school, or retired or disabled (54 percent). A larger portion of unemployed parents in MEES projects fell into this category, compared to 38 percent for Even Start projects nationally. Conversely, 15 percent of unemployed MEES parents were enrolled in school, while 45 percent of unemployed parents across all Even Start projects were enrolled in school at the time of intake.

Exhibit 3.8		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents Who Were Not Employed, by Employment Plans		
Enrolled in school	15%	(58)
Retired or disabled	2%	(9)
Currently seeking employment	28%	(110)
Not currently seeking employment	54%	(211)
Total	100%	(388)
Note: The percentages are based on the MEES parents who were not employed at the time of enrollment.		

Family Economic Characteristics

Eighty-five (85) percent of the families served by the MEES had annual incomes of less than \$15,000 at the time of intake (Exhibit 3.9). With the average family size of 6, this is well below the poverty level. A sizeable portion of the MEES families reported severely low incomes; 25 percent earned and/or received annual incomes of less than \$6,000. However, the percentage of MEES families in this poorest income range was smaller compared to 57 percent of all Even Start families who were in this income range. This may be due, in large part, to the fact that most of the MEES families are two-parent families in which at least one parent may earn wages from employment.

Exhibit 3.9		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Annual Income		
Under \$9,000	46%	(306)
\$9,000 - \$11,999	23%	(149)
\$12,000 - \$14,999	16%	(104)
\$15,000 or more	15%	(103)
Total	100%	(662)

At the time of intake, 82 percent of families served by the MEES reported that wages from a job were their primary source of income (Exhibit 3.10). In contrast, only 46 percent of all Even Start families reported wages as the primary source, and the remaining relied on government assistance. Though only 14 percent of the MEES families reported government assistance as the main source of income, 30 percent of MEES parents indicated receiving welfare in the past, and 29 percent reported that they were currently receiving welfare (Exhibit 3.11).

Exhibit 3.10		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Primary Income Source		
Wages from a job	82%	(555)
Alimony or child support	1%	(7)
Government assistance (e.g., AFDC)	14%	(95)
Other	3%	(18)
Total	100%	(675)

Non-Even Start Services Families Received

New families were asked what educational and support services they had received prior to, and at the time of, enrolling in the MEES Program. The percentage of MEES families that received welfare (30 percent) is much lower than the percentage among all Even Start families (44 percent), reflecting the greater prevalence of two-parent families with income from wages in the MEES population. In general, only a small percentage of MEES families received non-Even Start educational and social services (Exhibit 3.11). However, 24 percent of the MEES parents had received some ESL instruction prior to MEES, compared to 10 percent of all Even Start families.

The number of MEES parents who had received employment training, vocational education, and/or vocational rehabilitation services prior to MEES was negligible.

Exhibit 3.11				
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Social or Educational Services Received				
	Before MEES		At Time of Intake	
Welfare	30%	(371)	29%	(350)
Employment training	3%	(38)	2%	(24)
Vocational education	5%	(58)	5%	(63)
Vocational rehabilitation	<1%	(2)	<1%	(2)
Beginning adult basic education (grades 0-4)	3%	(35)	N/A	N/A
Intermediate adult basic education (grades 5-8)	2%	(25)	N/A	N/A
Adult secondary education (grades 9-12) or GED preparation	7%	(89)	N/A	N/A
ESL	24%	(289)	N/A	N/A
Note: Total N=1226. "N/A" indicates that data were not collected regarding non-Even Start educational services at the time of intake.				

Prior to the MEES, many of the children had participated in some type of early childhood education (ECE) programs such as Head Start, kindergarten, primary school, and other preschool or infant/toddler programs (Exhibit 3.12). However, for 36 percent of children served by the MEES, the MEES was the only source of educational services.

Exhibit 3.12 Percent of Children Participating in Non-MEES Educational Programs Before and at Time of Enrolling in MEES		
	Before MEES	At Intake
Head Start	13%	8%
Title I preschool	4%	3%
Early intervention, early childhood special education	2%	6%
Other preschool or infant/toddler program	10%	5%
Kindergarten	14%	10%
Primary school (grades 1-3)	12%	15%
None	36%	36%

English Language Proficiency Among MEES Parents

Over two-thirds of MEES parents speak Spanish at home (Exhibit 3.13). Eighty-two percent of MEES parents speak a language other than English compared to 37 percent of parents across all Even Start projects.

Exhibit 3.13		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Language Spoken at Home		
	Percent (Number)	
English	18%	(182)
Spanish	65%	(653)
Other	17%	(176)
Total	100%	(1011)

Of the MEES parents who speak languages other than English at home, the majority do not understand, speak, or read English well or at all (75, 78, and 82 percent, respectively) (Exhibit 3.14). Non-English speaking parents across all Even Start projects also reported similar levels of English language limitations.

Exhibit 3.14				
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Their Ability to Use the English Language				
How well does adult...	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Not at All
Understand English	8% (66)	17% (142)	52% (427)	23% (191)
Speak English	7% (56)	15% (122)	50% (414)	28% (234)
Read English	6% (46)	13% (109)	44% (359)	38% (312)
Note: The percentages are based on 826 adults who speak languages other than English at home.				

Section Four

Participation Outcomes of Migrant Education Even Start Families

This section describes the extent of participation in MEES educational services by parents and children. Participation data were collected for all families that enrolled in the MEES in 1994-95. Because the data reported were collected as part of the national Even Start evaluation, most of the participation questions were asked in terms of the entire program year covering a 12-month period. This is an appropriate time frame to use in order to standardize the collection of participation data across all projects. However, in many MEES projects, families are mobile. Information gathered from site visits conducted for the Study of Migrant Education Even Start Projects indicated that families in some MEES projects have a cyclical, seasonal participation pattern. They participate during certain months of the year and return after several months of migratory residence in other states. In some projects, only a small number of families return on a regular, cyclical basis, and the period of participation for most parents and children is limited to one migratory season. On the other end of the spectrum, some migrant families remain in one location, where children can attend the same schools year round, while one parent may move with migratory employment.

In the absence of information on the duration of enrollment for each family during the 1994-95 program year, the data presented in this section are averages for the entire year which may tend to underestimate the extent of participation by migrant families *during the months of enrollment in MEES*.

This section addresses the following topics:

- Number of home visits made to MEES families;
- Extent of MEES parents' participation in adult education and parenting education services;
- Extent of MEES children's participation in early childhood education services;
- Types of support services received by MEES families;
- Prevalence of children with special needs;
- Extent of retention and successful completion of MEES services;
- Parents' educational status at year end; and
- Parents' employment status at year end.

Home Visits Made to Families

On average, the MEES families participated in 12 home visits during the 1994-95 program year, about once a month. This average is higher than the national Even Start average of 9 home visits. The number of home visits across families ranged widely from none at all to 86 during the year. The top 25 percent of families had 18 or more visits during the year, while the bottom 25 percent had 2 or fewer visits.

Extent of Participation in Adult Education and Parenting Education

The basic Even Start model stipulates that at least one parent and one child participate in all three core services: adult education, parenting education, and early childhood education. Only 70 percent of MEES parents participated in parenting education activities, compared to 88 percent of all Even Start parents.

A quarter of the parents served by the MEES, for whom we received participation data forms, did not participate in any core educational services (Exhibit 4.1). About one-half of MEES parents were enrolled in ESL; 15 percent participated in beginning adult basic education classes. However, only 8 and 9 percent enrolled in intermediate or secondary adult education classes, respectively. In comparison, 42 percent of all Even Start parents participated in secondary adult education and GED preparation courses. The results for MEES parents are consistent with their relatively limited educational experiences and the fact that many of them need ESL instruction before they can turn their efforts toward basic education taught in English.

Exhibit 4.1

Percent (Number) of MEES
Parents Who Participated in the Core MEES Services

Parenting education	70%	(719)
Beginning adult basic education (grades 0-4)	15%	(166)
Intermediate adult basic education (grades 5-8)	8%	(91)
Adult secondary education (grades 9-12) or GED preparation	9%	(101)
ESL	47%	(520)
None	25%	(281)

Note: Total N=1110. Each parent could participate in one or more services.

Hours of Participation in Adult and Parenting Education

Including the 25 percent of MEES parents who reported zero hours of participation, the average number of hours of participation in adult education for MEES parents was 33 during the 1994-95 program year (Exhibit 4.2). The adult education hours varied widely, ranging from 0 to 1,050 hours. The top 25 percent participated in 33 hours or more.

On average, the MEES parents participated in parenting education for 16 hours during the 1994-95 program year. The top 25 percent participated for 20 hours or more; the median was 7 hours.

The average participation hours for MEES parents were considerably fewer than the national Even Start averages of 92 hours for adult education and 30 hours of parenting education. Again, we need to recognize that for some parents served by the MEES, all of their participation hours may have occurred in a 3-4 month period.

Exhibit 4.2				
MEES Parents and All Even Start Parents, by Average Hours of Participation in Adult and Parenting Education				
	MEES Parents		All Even Start Parents	
	Include Non-Participants	Participants Only	Include Non-Participants	Participants Only
Adult education	33 hrs	48 hrs	92 hrs	100 hrs
Parenting education	16 hrs	22 hrs	30 hrs	32 hrs
Note: Total N=1,110 for MEES parents, 24,621 for all Even Start parents. Non-participants are parents who reported zero hours of participation; participants are parents who reported one or more hours of participation.				

Extent of Participation in Early Childhood Education

Overall, 95 percent of 1,101 MEES children, for whom we received participation information, participated in some form of early childhood education (ECE) services sponsored by the MEES. As shown in Exhibit 4.3, the most common types of ECE services were: structured, center-based programs (30 percent) and individualized, home-based programs (47 percent). (The percentages in Exhibit 4.3 total more than 100 percent because projects could report more than one type of program for each child.)

Over 20 percent of the MEES children were enrolled in compulsory education programs covering grades K-3 in which the educational activities were coordinated with the MEES activities. Another 25 percent of the MEES children attended day care programs that included educational components. Presumably, these may be provided by collaborating agencies of the MEES grantee and may not be under the direct control of MEES project staff. Finally, approximately 6 percent of children participated in educational activities for school-age children that are not part of their compulsory education curricula. These services could be provided either directly by MEES projects or their collaborating agencies.

Only 5 percent of the MEES children were reported to have received no ECE services. This compares favorably to the finding that 11 percent of all Even Start children did not participate in any early childhood education services.

Exhibit 4.3		
Percent (Number) of MEES Children Participating in Early Childhood Education Programs		
Organized, center-based ECE	30%	(333)
Individualized, home-based ECE	47%	(520)
Daycare with educational component	25%	(270)
Services for school-age children outside school hours	6%	(65)
Compulsory schooling (K-3) coordinating with MEES	22%	(244)
None	5%	(54)
Note: Total N=1,101.		

The extent of children's participation was assessed by asking how many months they participated in early childhood education programs. Almost 30 percent of the children served by the MEES participated for only 1 to 3 months; another 30 percent participated 4 to 6 months (Exhibit 4.4). Forty-one percent of MEES children participated for over 6 months, while the comparable percentage was 52 percent for all Even Start children.

Exhibit 4.4		
Percent of MEES Children and All Even Start Children, by Months of Participation in Early Childhood Education		
	MEES Children	All Even Start Children
1 - 3 months	29%	29%
4 - 6 months	30%	20%
7 - 9 months	20%	26%
10 - 12 months	21%	26%
Total	100%	101%

Support Services Parents and Children Received

The Even Start basic model stipulates provision of support services to allow parents and children to benefit fully from the educational opportunities made available through the program. As shown in Exhibit 4.5, the support services most commonly received by MEES parents were child care (45 percent), social services (40 percent), health care (39 percent), and transportation (35 percent). **Twenty-eight percent of the MEES parents did not receive any type of support services compared to 16 percent of all Even Start parents receiving no support services.**

A large percentage of children participating in the MEES Program received some sort of support services. Over half of the children received child care (63 percent), transportation (57 percent), health care (56 percent), and meals (50 percent). **Only 11 percent of the MEES children received no support services compared to 23 percent of all Even Start children receiving no support services.**

Exhibit 4.5				
Percent of Parents and Children Receiving Support Services				
	Parents		Children	
	MEES	All Even Start	MEES	All Even Start
Transportation	35%	45%	57%	44%
Child care	45%	53%	63%	48%
Meals	31%	39%	50%	47%
Employment assistance	25%	18%	N/A	N/A
Counseling	N/A	N/A	24%	11%
Family support	29%	39%	N/A	N/A
Health care referral, screening	39%	27%	56%	27%
Social services	40%	34%	N/A	N/A
Translator, interpreter	34%	14%	41%	10%
None	28%	16%	11%	23%
Note: "N/A" indicates the types of support services that were assessed only for parents or children, but not both.				

Number of Children with Special Needs

A relatively small percentage of MEES children (9 percent) have special needs. As shown on Exhibit 4.6, among the children identified with special needs, the three most common types of needs are: speech/language impairment (31 percent); specific learning disabilities (22 percent); and developmental delays (17 percent).

Exhibit 4.6		
Number and Percent of MEES Children with Special Needs, by Type of Needs		
	Number	Percent
Speech/language impairment	29	31%
Visual impairment	7	7%
Hearing impairment	4	4%
Orthopedic impairment	5	5%
Serious emotional disturbance	3	3%
Mental retardation	3	3%
Specific learning disability	21	22%
Developmentally delayed	16	17%
Other	36	38%
Note: The percentages are based on 91 MEES children identified with special needs.		

Patterns of Retention

We examined the patterns of retention in the MEES Program through analyses of the following data:

- Whether or not each family was still participating at the end of the 1994-95 program year;
- If a family had exited the program during the year, the specific reasons for termination; and
- For the families that exited, whether they had completed their educational goals or exited due to "negative reasons" such as failure to attend scheduled educational activities.

The results of analyses using these measures of retention and termination are presented below.

At the end of the 1994-95 program year, 67 percent of the MEES families were continuing participation (Exhibit 4.7). Of the 229 families that were not continuing, 5 percent had met or completed their goals (Exhibit 4.8). These results are generally consistent with the results for all Even Start families.

Exhibit 4.7		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families Continuing Participation at Year End		
Continuing participation	67%	(462)
No longer participating	33%	(229)
Total	100%	(691)

Given that the primary target of the MEES projects are migrant families, it is surprising that only 27 percent of families terminated due to moving out of the area (Exhibit 4.8). A total of 22 percent of the MEES families exited due to negative reasons: 4 percent due to lack of interest; 12 percent due to poor attendance records; and 6 percent due to family problems and crises preventing participation. However, this 22 percent is substantially lower than the comparable percentage reported for all Even Start families (38 percent). Thirteen percent of the parents found employment that prevented them from continuing in the program, most likely due to schedule conflicts.

Exhibit 4.8		
Percent (Number) of MEES Families, by Reason for Termination		
Met planned goals	5%	(11)
Switched to different program	1%	(3)
Moved out of the area served by the MEES project	27%	(60)
Lack of interest	4%	(9)
Incomplete participation or poor attendance	12%	(26)
Parent(s) found employment that prevents further participation	13%	(29)
Family crisis prevents further participation	2%	(4)
Conflicts or problems prevented continued participation	4%	(9)
Other reason	31%	(71)
Reason unknown	2%	(4)
Note: Percentages are based on 226 families that exited the MEES Program.		

Parents' Educational Status at Year End

As shown in Exhibit 4.9, attaining a GED was not a goal for the majority of MEES parents (56 percent). Less than one-third worked towards a diploma or GED, and very few parents attained a diploma or GED since participating in the MEES Program (2 percent).

Exhibit 4.9		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Educational Status at the End of the Year		
Received high school diploma, GED, or equivalent prior to Even Start	13%	(118)
GED is not a current goal for this adult	56%	(490)
Has been working toward a diploma or GED	27%	(235)
Has taken the GED tests but has not completed them or passed yet	2%	(14)
Has attained a diploma or GED since participating in Even Start	2%	(19)
Has been accepted at a community college, college, or university	<1%	(5)
Total	100%	(881)

Parents' Employment Status at Year End

Close to 60 percent of the MEES parents were employed at the end of the year in either a full-time or part-time paying job (Exhibit 4.10). Thirteen percent of MEES parents were unemployed but were either looking for work or enrolled in a vocational or educational program. Twenty-eight percent were unemployed and neither looking for work nor getting more education or training.

Exhibit 4.10		
Percent (Number) of MEES Parents, by Employment Status at the End of the Year		
Employed in full-time paying job	29%	(293)
Employed in part-time or seasonal paying job	29%	(296)
Employed through a job training program	<1%	(5)
Unemployed, but enrolled in a vocational or educational program	4%	(40)
Unemployed, but retired or disabled	1%	(11)
Unemployed and looking for work	9%	(86)
Unemployed and none of the above apply	28%	(279)
Total	100%	(1,010)